

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:	)	Group Art Unit: <b>2841</b>
	)	
<b>Yoshinari Matsuda, et al.</b>	)	Examiner: <b>Dameon E. Levi</b>
	)	
Application No. <b>09/671,436</b>	)	
	)	
Filed: <b>September 27, 2000</b>	)	
	)	
For: <b>PRINTED WIRING BOARD AND DISPLAY</b>	)	
<b>APPARATUS</b>	)	

Mail Stop Issue Fee  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO INTERVIEW SUMMARY AND REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Dear Sir:

Applicants appreciate the issuance of the Notice of Allowance with the accompanying Interview Summary and statement of the Examiner's reasons for allowance. However, Applicants wish to respond to and clarify these statements.

With respect to the Interview Summary, Applicants submit, as they did during the Interview, that claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8 were cancelled in order to permit claims to 9-20 to proceed to issuance, without comment as to their patentability. Applicants did not cancel the claims in order to distinguish an invention from the prior art, to the extent that statement is understood by Applicants. Applicants expressly reserved the right to file a continuation application directed to the scope of former claims 1-8, and may indeed exercise that right. Furthermore, Applicants perfected their claim of priority on June 9, 2003, which resulted in the Stevens reference, among others, being withdrawn as prior art during prosecution.

With respect to the Examiner's reasons for allowance, this response is a disavowal of any acquiescence in any particular claim interpretation that might be attributed to the Examiner in the reason for allowance. Claim interpretation is established as a matter of law by the courts during appropriate adversarial proceedings. Any comment made by the Examiner is not necessarily shared by Applicants. Applicants do not waive any right to establish any claim interpretation, albeit different or even contrary to the Examiner's interpretation, that can be supported by the record in this matter.

Moreover, while Applicants believe at least the allowed claims are allowable at least for the reasons of record, there might be other bases for allowability not yet fully explored or established. The reason for allowance sets forth only one view expressed by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 29, 2008

By: David R. Metzger/  
David R. Metzger  
Registration No. 32,919  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000